

Remarks

Claims 1-36 and 38 are pending in the application. Claim 37 has been canceled. Claims 1, 21-25, 34, and 36 have been amended. No claims have been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of this amendment. Reconsideration of the application as amended is requested. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the helpful interview on July 18, 2001 during which the claim rejections and the proposed Examiner's amendment was discussed.

Allowance

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 2-13, 17-20, 31-33, 35 and 37-38 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections--35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 21, 23, 24, 34, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wahler et al. Apparently with respect to the rejection of claim 1, the examiner states that Wahler discloses a hub comprising a first opening extending axially into the hub, the first opening having an inner surface; an integral key (6) extending radially inward from the inner surface of the first opening; and an integral stop (4") extending across at least a portion of one of the first and second ends of the opening.

However, claim 1, as amended states:

an integral key extending radially inward from said inner surface of said first opening, said integral key extending at least part of the way along said inner surface between said first end and said second end for engaging the keyway **for preventing relative rotation between said hub and the shaft** when said hub is disposed on the shaft

Griddles 6 of Wahler do not prevent relative rotation. Actually rotation is prevented by protrusion 7 that fits into groove 7' of shaft 2. Griddles (6) of Wahler perform a different function entirely; they hold shaft 2 in the opening against protrusion 7 so shaft 2 does not come out of protrusion 7. Without protrusion 7 preventing relative rotation, shaft 2 would rotate as griddles 6 slide in circular groove 6'.

Since Wahler uses protrusion 7 to prevent relative rotation of hub on shaft there would be no reason to also provide an integral key extending radially inward from the inner surface of the first opening for engaging the keyway for preventing relative rotation of the hub on the shaft when the hub

is disposed on the shaft. In any case, griddles (6) of Wahler do not perform that function. Thus, the present invention, as amended, is clearly distinguished from the teaching and suggestion of Wahler. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1, as amended, and claims dependent thereon, has been traversed.

Claim 21, as amended, states:

an integral stop extending across only a portion of said first end, said integral stop for preventing the shaft from extending beyond said hub when said hub is disposed on the shaft.

There is no teaching or suggestion in Wahler to provide the integral stop extending across only a portion of the first end. Since Wahler uses the protrusion on the stop to drive the rotation of the hub, it would be difficult to design the stop with the protrusion so the stop extends across only a portion of the end. Therefore, the rejection of claim 21, as amended, and claims dependent thereon, has been traversed.

The Examiner rejects claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson et al. The examiner states that "Johnson discloses a hub comprising a first face and a second face, an opening extending there between, the opening having a length between the first face and the second face, the opening having a circular shape except for an integral key substantially the entire length of the opening, the opening and the key having a keyway."

As amended to include the limit of an integral stop, claim 34 is clearly distinguished from Johnson. None of the references teach a hub having an integral key extending along an inner surface and also having an integral stop. Where there is a stop, as in Wahler, the key is on the stop, not extending radially inward from said inner surface.

Claim 37 has been rewritten in independent form by including it with the limits of claim 36, as suggested by the Examiner to provide new claim 36. The Examiner has said this would make claim 37 allowable. In addition, applicant has included further clarification in claim 36 similar to that suggested by the Examiner. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) has therefore been traversed.

Claim Rejections--35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner states that claims 14-16 are rejected as being product by process and not given patentable weight, and since claims 15-16 further limit claim 14, they are also rejected. Further the Examiner notes that Johnson teaches powdered metal elements and that they are well known in the art. However, since claim 1, as amended, is clearly distinguished, dependent claims 14-16 are also distinguished. Thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been traversed.

The Examiner rejects claims 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Wahler. The Examiner acknowledges that there is no teaching of the shapes provided in these claims.

The Examiner states that the shapes are considered to be a design consideration within the skill in the art. However, since claim 1, as amended, is clearly distinguished, dependent claims 25-30 are also distinguished. Thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been traversed.

Entry of the Present Amendment after Final

Applicant requests that the present amendment be entered. Applicant is presenting this amendment under 37 CFR 1.116. The present amendments comply with a requirement of form expressly set forth in a previous Office action. The amendments present rejected claims in better form for allowance or consideration on appeal.

Applicant believes the present amendment to claims 1, 21, 34, and 36 do not introduce new matter or new issues for search or consideration. The amendment to claim 1 adds a limit that is already in claim 21. The additional limit overcomes the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103. The amendment also adds clarification requested by the Examiner. The amendment materially assists in placing the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner has already searched this limit in connection with review of claim 21. Similarly, the amendment to claim 36 by the addition of the limit of claim 37 puts claim 36 in condition for allowance as stated by the Examiner. Furthermore, the amendment to claim 34 adds a limit already in claim 1 and adds the clarification requested by the Examiner for the other claims, .

Applicant believes that the proposed amendments to claims 1, 21, 34, and 36 place the case in better form for appeal, or in condition for allowance. (A) The claims, if amended as proposed, would avoid the rejections set forth in the last Office action, and thus the amendment would place the case in condition for allowance or in better condition for appeal. (B) The claims, if amended as proposed, would not raise the issue of new matter since no new matter is included in any amendment. (C) The claims as amended present no new issues requiring further consideration or search. (D) The amendment presents no additional claims.

It is believed that the claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration. If there are any questions please call applicant's attorney, James M. Leas at 802 864-1575.

Respectfully submitted,
By: Tyler R. Dawson, Inventor
Tel: (802) 482-4426

Tyler R. Dawson
349 Highlands Drive
Williston, VT 05495